DOUBLE TRANSLATIONS AS A CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE OF THE OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC TRANSLATION OF JOHN CHRYSOSTOM’S COMMENTARIES ON ACTS

Introduction

The New Testament book *Acts of the Apostles*, although part of the Church life throughout Eastertide, was apparently “seldom preached upon”1. John Chrysostom’s series *Homiliae 55 in Acta apostolorum* (CPG 4426) is one of the very few extant commentaries on this New Testament book, and it is by far the most important among them. Chrysostom’s homilies on *Acts* have come down to us in more than 100 complete or partial copies, according to Pinakes2 – a testament to their popularity in Byzantium. The homilies had an ancient Armenian version dating from 1077, apart from various epitomes and fragments in the catenae3, but it is unclear whether there existed an Armenian translation earlier than 10774. Even though some commentators suggested that the 11th century translation

---


2 http://pinakes.ihrt.cnrs.fr/ [1 VIII 2019].

3 Some more information on the Armenian catenae see in: R.V. CHETANIAN, *La version arménienne ancienne des “Homélies sur les Actes des Apôtres” de Jean Chrysostome. Homélies I, II, VII, VIII*, Leuven 2004 [= CSCO.SA, 27–28], p. XX–XXXII. Rose V. CHETANIAN, the editor and translator of the Armenian versions of homilies 1, 2, 7, and 8, presents a rather fuzzy picture: Other than many fragments in catenae, the original text is presented in two manuscripts, one of them containing a complete translation done in 1077 from the Greek (ibidem, p. VII). This translation was revised in the 12th–13th century, ibidem, p. XXXVIII–XL.

4 An undated Armenian translation is mentioned in CPG 4426. At the beginning of her survey, R.V. CHETANIAN states: *La question qui se pose est de savoir si ces épitomes ont été faits à partir des tradictions arméniennes ou s’ils reproduisent des épitomes grecs qui existaient déjà; si tel est le cas, il
replaced an earlier one that was lost, there is no firm evidence in this respect. The currently available data do not support the assumption that other ancient translations of John Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts existed before the 10th century, apart from an early Latin translation which is now lost. Such being the case, the earliest preserved non-Greek version of these homilies is the Old Church Slavonic translation originating from the city of Preslav in the first quarter of the 10th century.

**Chrysostom’s Commentaries on Acts in the Zlatostruy Collection**

The Old Church Slavonic translation of the Chrysostomian series is not complete and, unlike the 11th-century Armenian version, it is not reliable as regards the Greek text. Not only is it selective and partial, but also it does not always correspond to the known Greek text. I will address some of these issues below.

At least 18 (out of 55) homilies on Acts were translated into Old Church Slavonic, namely the ethica of homilies 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 12, 18, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 34, 36, 44, 45 and fragments from homilies 37, 45 and 48. The translated texts were included in the renown *Chrysorrhoas* collection (Zlatostruy) as individual homilies or as part of compilations. Considering the fact that the circulation of these homilies in the medieval Slavonic world was closely entwined with Zlatostruy, some features of the entire collection are particularly relevant to our understanding of the individual texts on Acts:

1. The Zlatostruy collection is preserved only in late copies (mostly from 14th–15th century onwards). All of them attest to later stages of the text history with secondary changes such as revisions, omissions, additions, etc.

---

*faudrait s’interroger sur la date à laquelle a été faite la traduction en arménien, sur le(s) traducteur(s), sur le lieu de traduction (ibidem, p. XXIII).*

5 R.V. Chétanian calls it “une information difficilement vérifiable” and abstains from postulating a lost “Golden Age” translation, *ibidem*, p. XXXVIII–XXXIX.


2. There are several versions of Zlatostruy, most notably the Longer (L) and the Shorter Zlatostruy (S) with 138 and 81 homilies respectively. They have 62 homilies in common, L is more faithful to the Greek sources (and presumably to the initial translation), but S is preserved in the oldest copy – a 12th century manuscript from the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg, Fп.1.469.

3. The original translation was made in the first quarter of the 10th century in Preslav as a project initiated and supervised by the Bulgarian Tsar Symeon (893–927). Although no manuscript from this time-period has survived, the later copies are considered relatively reliable in respect of the original translation, especially the first 45 homilies of the longer version L.

4. The homilies in the Zlatostruy collection were translated by more than one translator (and most probably by more than two) – the homilies differ in terms of principles of translation, usage of concurring means of expression, and vocabulary. We can cautiously suggest, that the Bulgarian compilers and translators selected the texts from numerous manuscripts containing John Chrysostom's works and divided them between each other.

In this context the Commentaries on Acts occupy an important place in Zlatostruy. With partial translations of 18 homilies – ethica and fragments – it is the best represented homiletical series in the Old Bulgarian collection (other Old Church Slavonic homilies selected from Chrysostom's commentaries include e.g. 17 homilies on the First Epistle to Corinthians, 10 homilies on the Epistle to Romans, 7 on the Gospel of Matthew, etc.). All but one of the translated homilies on Acts are included in L (four homilies in the first part L1–45, the others in the second part L46–137), and all of them are present in the other Zlatostruy versions (the longer L, the shorter S, the Hilandar version, and others). It allows us to make the safe assumption that these homilies were part of the original collection – the one translated and compiled in the early 10th century Preslav before the additions and revisions characteristic for the later stages of formation of the collection.

---

9 None of the manuscripts of L is edited, S has several editions, the earliest copy from the 12th century is edited in Т. ГЕОРГИЕВА, Златоструй от XII век, Силистра 2003.
10 There are many pieces of evidence to the time and place of the translation, the most compelling being the original preface, where Tsar Symeon is mentioned, cf. Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, Златоструй…, p. 7–12; А. ДИМИТРОВА, Златоструят…, p. 9–10. Some of the manuscripts with fewer scribal errors and deviations from Greek date from the 15th century and contain only the first 45 homilies of L, e.g. Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg, MS No 33.2.12, Russian State History Museum, Moscow, collection of the Chudov monastery, MS No 214, and others. More on the manuscripts see in Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, Златоструй…, p. 21–28.
12 This complicated issue is well clarified in Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод…, p. 73–82.
On the other hand, the Slavonic translation of the *Commentaries on Acts* differs from the other homilies in *Zlatostruy*. There are many discrepancies between the Slavonic texts and their Greek counterparts, explanatory and expanded renditions of some phrases and passages are very common, and in some cases, the abridgements and transformations are so big that the Greek source is unrecognisable. There are two possible explanations of this incongruity: 1. the medieval Bulgarian translators had at their disposal a manuscript with a very different Greek recension of Chrysostom’s homilies on *Acts* that did not coincide with either the “rough” or the “smooth” recensions we know today\(^\text{13}\); 2. all the selected homilies on *Acts* had only one Slavonic translator (or perhaps two – a “radical” and a more “conservative” one), and the discrepancies come down to the translator’s free approach to the original. The evidence is not convincing enough to support either of these explanations, but one specific type of deviations of the Slavonic translation from the Greek source is particularly interesting – the double translations.

**Double translations**

The term “double translation” (doublet, Doppelübersetzung) denotes the technique where *one* word from the source text is rendered with *two* words in the translation. It allows keeping the equivalence between the source and the target language both in terms of form and sense, hence it is considered a method of literal translation\(^\text{14}\). The researchers give two main explanations of the phenomenon – when marginal notes and glosses were incorporated into the main text, or when the translator used two words for emphasis and clarity. The double translations are a widely used method across various time-periods and languages – there are examples in the Septuagint, in medieval translations, in the oriental traditions, as well as in translations into modern languages\(^\text{15}\). In the medieval Slavonic literature

\(^\text{13}\) Despite all the differences, at least half of the Slavonic homilies follow accurately the Greek source and they almost always stand closer to the so-called “rough” recension, cf. А. Димитрова, Гръцките версии на Златоустовите коментари върху Посланието на ап. Павел до Тит и Деяния на апостолите в сборника „Златоструй“, Pbg 40, 3, 2016, p. 29–42.


the most prominent author and translator known for his extensive use of double translations is John the Exarch. This linguistic device is so typical of his work that it helped identify and ascribe the anonymous translation of Chrysostom's *Vita* to John the Exarch himself or someone from his circle in the first decades of the 10th century. However, double translations are not unique to this particular author from the Preslav literary school. They are present in other Slavonic translations as well, e.g. in the so-called *Nomokanon* of Methodius from the 9th century, in the translation from Latin of the Gospel commentaries of Pope Gregory the Great in the 10th–11th century, and in the monk Isaiah's translation of pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in the 14th century, to name a few.

The *Zlatostruy* collection also belongs to this group of texts. The homilies are not linguistically uniform and they reveal varying styles of multiple translators, but most translations can be defined as free yet relatively accurate. As pointed out above, Greek words and phrases often have descriptive and explanatory Slavonic renderings, and double translations are only part of the verbal inequivalence in the collection. Six out of the 18 homilies on *Acts* included in the collection are not

---


suitable for a comparative study, because they deviate significantly from the available Greek texts either due to revisions or because of a different Greek original. Another two translations are fragmentary and are also not discussed here. In the remaining ten homilies, there are at least 90 instances of double translations (nouns, verbs, and adjectives only), some texts containing up to 24 examples. The examined homilies are the following:\footnote{This list of homilies follows their attestation in the longer Zlatostruy (L). The earliest and most accessible complete copy of L1–137 – manuscript No 43 from the Moscow Theological Academy, 1474 (cetera: MTA 43), is available at http://old.stsl.ru/manuscripts/medium.php?col=5&manuscript=043. Homily S22 is present in the shorter Zlatostruy (S) and its earliest copy from Saint Petersburg’s Public Library En.I. 46 (12th century) is edited in Т. ГЕОРГИЕВА , Златоструй…, p. 104–110. All examples are cited after these two manuscripts. The Greek sources are cited according to their edition in vol. LX of Patrologia Graeca.}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item **L42 Inc.** Ητъ да пѫмѫнѫмѫ и тѫк нѫцѫ… (MTA 43, ff. 257r–258v). \textit{InAA hom. 36}, PG, vol. LX, col. 261–262.
  \item **S22 Inc.** Сѫѫѯ и лѫп YYS подѫдѫрѫкѫмѫ… (En.I. 46, ff. 43v–46v). \textit{InAA hom. 3}, PG, vol. LX, col. 38–42.
\end{itemize}

Although all the homilies attest to the use of double translations, the examples are unevenly distributed among them. Homily S22 has by far the most instances (24), followed by L41 (17 instances), L86 (12), L12 (11), L40 (7), L90 (7),
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L102 (5), L88 (4), L104 (2), L42 (1). Few of them seem to be of secondary origin such as later scribal revisions or integrated glosses, e.g. this sentence from L41 containing two pairs of double translations, χαλκοτύπος ‘(copper)smith’19 – златарь и кръвна, and сфура ‘hammer’ – млатъ кладъво: PG, vol. LX, col. 203 ως ὁ χαλκοτύπος σφυραν οὕτω βαρείαν καταφέρων / like the smith who lets fall such a heavy hammer20 – MTA 43, f. 256r акы златарь и кръв[а]ўн. млатъ кладъво. толя таънако на рамо кънєдъа. In this phrase there are many variant readings between the manuscripts, e.g. instead of златарь и кръвна (the mistake кръвна is also widely spread) one Hilandar manuscript21 has only кръвна, the 12th century copy of S – ковшници; instead of кладъво, there are variant readings кладъвъ, кладъвъ, even a correction to кладъ, and S and the Hilandar manuscript have only млатъ. It is easy to suggest that the proto-Bulgarian word кръвна needed a more common clarifying synonym (златарь), but it is more difficult to explain the asyndeton млатъ кладъво – млатъ is attested as early as Codex Suprasliensis, but кладъво is a rare and perhaps regional variant that may have joined the main text from the margins22.

Despite the fluctuation of some readings, most of the instances can be considered genuine, originating from the initial translation. In an attempt to prove this and to support the central proposition of this study – that double translations are a linguistic and stylistic device typical for the Slavonic translator of the homilies on Acts – I will examine in some detail nearly half of the examples. They constitute several types, although not all double translations can be easily ascribed to one of these groups.

1. **Proper Doppelübersetzungen**: one of the two translations renders the form (or etymology) and the other – the meaning of the Greek word. Many examples meet this requirement perfectly, e.g.:

ёклъсіа – L41 цръкъс рикъс съборъ, where съборъ ‘assembly’ is the etymological translation, and цръкъс ‘church’ conveys the usual meaning of ёклъсіа in Christianity;

---


21 This manuscript, Hilandar 386, Serbian, 14th century, is a rare South Slavonic copy, considered a separate version of Zlatostryu, closer to S, cf. Кл. Иванова-Константинова, Незвестна редакция на Златоструя в сръбски извод от XIII в., ЗИК 10, 1976, p. 89–107; Я. Милтенов, Златоструй..., p. 137–154.

22 In addition to this example from Zlatostryu, the word кладъво is attested also twice in the Old Testament (3Reg 6, 7 and Is 41, 7) and in Cosma’s *Oratio contra Bogomilos*, cf. М. Тотоманова-Панева, Книги Царства в славянската хронографска традиция, София 2019 [= КМс, 27], p. 132.
φιλάνθρωπος – L42 φιλάνθρωπος ανθρωποδίκη with ‘loving mankind’ being the formal equivalent, and ‘merciful’ – the semantic one;

ἀλγέω – L86 ἀλγεῖν ἔκλογη, where ‘feel pain’ renders the form, and ‘grieve’ – the meaning;

οἱ κατορθοῦντες ‘the righteous’ – L40 καθαρὸς κατορθοῦντες, (‘straight, upright’ – the form, ‘good’ – the meaning);

καθαρός – L86 καθαρός ἄμοιρος (‘clean’ – the form, ‘flawless’ – the meaning);

ἀναπνέω ‘take breath, recover’ – L41 ἀναπνέων ἀναπνεύσαι (‘take breath’ – the form, ‘cool down’ – the meaning), etc.

In most of the cases the two translations are connected by the conjunction ‘and’, but there are also more complicated and descriptive phrases, such as:

ἄμοιρος ‘without share, bereft of’, here in the context of baptism – PG, vol. LX, col. 23 ἀπελθὼν ἄμοιρος τῆς χάριτος / departeth this life with no portion in that grace23, i.e. unbaptized – the Slavonic translation in L102 has πολύνθ’ ἡ πρόγνωσ’ ἀμάρα ποιοῖ, with the periphrastic, albeit not entirely literal translation “who did not receive this gift”, and πολύνθ’ bearing the overall meaning ‘pagan, heathen’.

One example is particularly interesting and indicative. The Greek word ψυχή ‘soul’ has a simple and exact Slavonic match – душа, yet in the Zlatostruy homilies on Acts it is repeatedly rendered with double translations ‘soul and mind’ (душа и умъ, душа и утроба) in at least four different homilies.

S22 has two instances:

PG, vol. LX, col. 39 Οὐδὲν πλοίου κλυδωνιζομένου διενήνοχεν ἡ τοῦ ἱερέως ψυχή / The soul of a Bishop is for the world like a vessel in a storm24 – F.п.I. 46, f. 44a ηγεῖται ψυχήν πιθανοτιμωτὶ χοταίμα. ιγεῖται ψυχὴν επικρίτα χιπαί καὶ υμὸς;

PG, vol. LX, col. 42 ἐπεὶ τῇ λυπουμένῃ ψυχῇ καὶ παρενοχλεῖν δοκεῖ / to a sorrowful heart it seems even to be a trouble25 – F.п.I. 46, f. 46a διὰ παθήματος ἄμων Ἦμος. ἀμφε ἄνακτ’ τὸ καὶ τοῦ γούντ’. τεχνιτ.”

Homily L90 is also consistent in this respect:

PG, vol. LX, col. 61 Ἀλλὰ ταύτης τῆς ἐρημίας πολλῷ τοῦ μακροθύμου ἡ ψυχή / But sweeter far than this solitude is the soul of the longsuffering26 – MTA 43, f. 458r ηγεῖται τοῦ παντὸς ἐρημίας τῆς τρίσκελεος ἄμων καὶ τρισκέλεος οὕκα καὶ κροτάκαρο
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(later in the same passage ψυχή is rendered with υμъ at least two more times, the other double translation from this sentence – μακρόθυμος 'long-suffering, patient' κροτъкъ и трьпѣлъ – is also repeated below).

The example from L41 is a repetition of the whole phrase:

PG, vol. LX, col. 202 Ταῦτα πάντα ἱκανά ἐστι διαναστῆσαι ψυχήν / All this is enough to arouse the soul27 – MTA 43, f. 255r κε δε θαλῇ τη κε ακοίμητι δῶς και υμας ουστακιν (ψυχή is rendered with υμας at least once more below).

The double rendition of ψυχή in L86 is adapted to the context:

PG, vol. LX, col. 313 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εὔρυχωτέραν ποιεῖ τὴν ψυχήν / It makes the soul more spacious than the heaven28 – MTA 43, f. 450r ενέ ωραν υψόμεν τερότερ δῶς και ουστροφος (followed by 2Cor 7, 2 κατεστίσε ας κα οκτφ ως αυλὴ, where the idea of ἁπαξλες as a vessel is contextually more appropriate).

I am not aware of another Slavonic work in which ψυχή is translated as υμας και υμα and it is one of the characteristic features of the Slavonic translation of Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts29.

Although these examples are in perfect agreement with what E. Hansack refers to as “stylistic doublets”30, the translator’s pursuit of an accurate formal and semantic equivalence is not the only raison d’être of double translations. The Slavonic translation tends to explain and sometimes to adapt the Greek text to its audience and often does not adhere to the formal features of the original.

2. Complementary double translations: when the Greek word has a complex meaning or does not have a single Slavonic counterpart and the two translations complement one another.

Several examples belong to this type, e.g.:

σφριγάω ‘to be vigorous, in full health and strength’ – L12 ισχυ και τουχκη κβιτι ‘to be young and lush’, where neither of the Slavonic words is an exact match to the Greek verb, but together they convey the meaning well;

29 Nevertheless, the Slavonic υμα for ψυχή is attested in some of the earliest manuscripts, such as Clozianus and Suprasliensis, cf. Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. (Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae), vol. I–LII, ed. J. Kurz et al., Praha 1958–1997 (s.v. υμα).
30 Entscheidend für das Verständnis und damit für die Wiedergabe der Mehrfachübersetzungen ist die Erkenntnis, daß es sich bei ihnen nicht um Synonyme im herkömmlichen Sinn (= semantisch leicht differenzierte Wörter) oder gar um Varianten handelt – so wurden sie bisher verstanden – sondern um stilistische ’Dubletten’, deren jede in ihrem Stil (”wörtliche” oder ”sinngemäße Übersetzung als Stil verstanden) genau dasselbe ausdrückt wie ihr Partner im anderen Stil, E. Hansack, Zum Übersetzungsstil... p. 135.
προσκυνέω ‘fall down and worship’ – L88 κλαίεινε ματινι μελονι ματινι with the same meaning;

παννυχίς ‘watching all night, vigil’ – L41 κτίσθανε μελιτε μελιτε ‘rising and prayer’
(in the same homily there is another – single – translation of παννυχίς as οικνο-, whereas in S22 the translation is descriptive – νυχα εκερκειε κα μαλακε);

συναλίζομαι ‘come together’, literally ‘eat salt with’ – L102 ἑτε υππην (a reference to Act 1, 4, the Old Church Slavonic translation of Acts has only ἑτε).

This kind of double translations is indicative not of inaptitude, but rather of translator’s ingenuity. The careful wording of the Slavonic translation is evident in a passage about self-restraint in L12 (InAA hom. 34), where the words φιλοσοφία and φιλόσοφος are rendered several times with double translations. The question about the early Christian shift in the meaning of φιλοσοφία has been widely discussed in the past several decades31. A simplified outline of the meanings of this term in patristic literature, and in John Chrysostom in particular, can be presented as follows32: pagan philosophy (negative, inferior) – philosophy as a system of beliefs and practices – Christian doctrine (viewed as superior) – Christian way of life – ascetic (monastic) way of life – self-restraint and control – martyrdom (endurance in suffering). In the Zlatoostry collection ‘philosophy’ and its derivatives are mentioned many times, both in pagan and in Christian context. Some of the most common Slavonic parallels are мѫдролюбъ, любомѫдрьство, прѣмѫдрость, мѫдрость (‘wisdom’, ‘love of wisdom’) and even the untranslated Greek word философия in L8, but also къздрѫжѧннє (‘temperance’) in L13, L25, L27. The double translations in L12 are unique to this homily and are part of a larger variety of solutions, e.g.:

φιλοσοφία κρѣпость и съмыслъ ‘strength and reason’, философос съмыслъ и нин къздрѫжѧ ca ‘reasonable or self-restrained’, крѣпъкъ и къздрѫжѧ сѧ

31 Here are some of the articles on this topic that were available to me, they provide a more extensive list of additional literature: G.J.M. Bartelink, “Philosophie” et “philosophe” dans quelques œuvres de Jean Chrysostome, RAM 36, 1960, p. 486–492 (a continuation of G. Bardy’s previous research on this matter in the works of authors from Clement of Alexandria to Eusebius of Caesarea – G.J.M. Bartelink is focused on Chrysostom’s works in volumes XLVIII–L of PG); A. Guillaumont, [rec.]: Anne-Marie Malingrey. “Philosophia”. Étude d’un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque, des pré-socratiques au IVe siècle après J.-C. – RHR 164, 2, 1963, p. 244–246 (a review article on A.-M. Malingrey’s doctoral thesis on the use of ‘philosophy’ from Pythagoras to John Chrysostom); J.L. Quan-tin, A propos de la traduction de ‘philosophia’ dans l’ ‘Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae’ de Saint Jean Chrysostome, RSR 61, 4, 1987, p. 187–197 (a reflection not only on the meaning of ‘philosophy’ in Chrysostom’s early work but also an emphasis on the ambiguous nature of the term – the author insists that this ambiguity should be preserved in translations).

'strong and self-restrained', κρήπικος 'strong', φιλοσοφεύω къ лъкрь строинъ 'to control in temperance'.
3. **Synonyms**: the two words in the double translation are synonyms and convey the original meaning equally well.

The double translations in this group usually correspond to a single meaning of the Greek word, whereas the previous two types (proper and complementary double translations) cover at least two different meanings or nuances of a complex word. Usually, the Slavonic synonyms in these cases are not interchangeable, e.g. one of them could be a common word, and the other – an archaism or a dialectism, but sometimes it is difficult to explain why the translator chose to use two equal words instead of one. Some of the most typical examples are the following:

σιγή ‘silence’ – L41 мълканине и щуканине

The second Slavonic word with the same meaning ‘silence, quietness’ is very rare, but not unique, cf. the verb щукати, also in a double translation of another Greek word in this homily:

ήσυχία ‘silence’ – L41, MTA 43, f. 254v како ти всє щукїй кесь плинця.

There is another double translation of the same Greek word:

ήσυχία – L90, MTA 43, f. 457v в некже великое мълкание есть и тихо всє.

It seems that the idea of ‘silence’ attracts the use of synonyms, although one word would have been enough, cf.:

σιγάω ‘keep quiet’ – S22 мълкати и не кескдокати ньуккое.

σκυθρωπός ‘sad, gloomy’ is translated in L86 as дряхлъ и скръбъ (perhaps the two words differ stylistically, although both are widely used in many Slavonic works in various genres).

The next examples show no obvious stratification between the synonyms, cf.:

θρῆνος (θρήνων) ‘lament, dirge’ – L41 слѣзныи (и) плакыгвын;

πενία ‘poverty’ – L40 упокоюство и нищета;

καταφρονέω ‘look down upon, despise’ – L90 прѣобѣдѣт и нѣркыи.

---

The use of synonyms as double translations adds to the stylistic and lexical richness of the Slavonic texts, but it may also point to hesitation and indecisiveness in the process of translating.

4. **Contextual synonyms**: the two Slavonic translations are an unlikely pair outside the context, but are a good match for the particular Greek text.

It is a matter of discussion whether some of the examples belong here, but this is an apprehension applicable to most classifications. Some instances provide an interesting insight into the translator’s work, where word choice is aimed at the Slavonic audience as much as it conveys the meaning of the Greek source.

In L41 στενωπός ‘narrow passage, alley’ is rendered as стыгна и дворъ ‘street and yard’ and this translation is used twice in the homily:

*PG*, vol. LX, col. 204 Ἐκεῖνοι διὰ ἀνθρώπων νόμον περιήλθαν ἐν κρυμῷ βοῶντες μεγάλα, καὶ διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν βαδίζοντες / [The night-watchers], by man’s law, go their rounds in the cold, shouting loudly, and *walking through lanes and alleys*\(^{35}\), MTA43, f. 256v Τῇ κόσμῳ, ἥλιος ἀλλὰ καὶ θεάσθη. ὁδῆς κείσο πολὺ πρέπει θυμός. Ἡ κυβρῖσις κελαίνει σκοτζής στεγνὺς ἔχονται. Ἡ κλαδοχύτης ἄκαρος (the whole phrase διὰ τῶν στενωπῶν βαδίζοντες is repeated);

*PG*, vol. LX, col. 202 Ἐν διακύπτεις εἰς τὸν στενωπὸν, οὐκ ἀκούσῃ οὔδὲ φωνής· ἀν ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, πάντας ὄψει καθάπε ς τὰ ἡμείνοις / *If thou (look out of window and) lean over into the street, thou wilt not hear even a sound; if thou look into the house, thou will see all lying as if they were in a tomb*\(^{36}\), MTA43, f. 256v αὐτοὶ καὶ σκοτεινὴ στεγνὴ στοιχεῖον. Ἔλθει βασίλειον σταύρῳ· τὰ μία σταυρῷ καὶ τὰ μία σταυρῷ· τὰ μία σταυρῷ. τὰ μία σταυρῷ. Although the second example is not a double translation and дворъ could be a mistake instead of the correct *домъ*, I think it is no accident that the same words стыгна and дворъ are used in this context.

The next examples are less controversial: the word βασίλειον (τὰ βασίλεια) ‘kingly dwelling, palace’ is rendered in two different homilies with similar double translations – in L40 as полатꙑ и владꙑлим and in S22 as къ полатꙑ къ владꙑлим. Both solutions are contextually appropriate and suggest a single translator. The closest counterpart of βασίλειον in the earliest Slavonic literature is полатꙑ цѣсарꙙ in Supr. 199, 2, no other double translation is attested\(^{37}\).

---

\(^{35}\) Chrysostom, vol. I, p. 380. It is interesting to point out, that the English translators also use a double translation here – ‘lanes and alleys’.

\(^{36}\) Chrysostom, vol. I, p. 378. In the English translation there is a note concerning the word στενωπός: *the lanes or alleys in the quarters formed by intersection of the broad streets*, ibidem, note y.

Some of the other contextual synonyms are the following:

ἄλογον ‘speechless, without reason; animal’ – L12 ΚΟΝ ΧΩΝ ΣΧΟΤΙ ΝΗΜ ‘horse or another animal’ (the word means ‘horse’ in medieval and modern Greek, at least from 6th century onwards38, and the Slavonic translator was apparently aware of it);

ξένος ‘foreign; guest’ – L88 ΗΠΝΗ Φ ΣΤΡΑΝΗΝ ‘destitute and foreign’ (it is clear that the translator adds some Christian nuances to the idea of hospitality – to welcome the stranger, who happens to be poor).

The last group of examples includes several related Greek words with consistent Slavonic double translations:

δόκιμος ‘trustworthy’ is rendered in S22 as НЕСКОУСЬН Φ СЛАВКИ ‘skilful and renowned’; and ἀδόκιμος ‘unsatisfactory, discredited’ – as НЕСКОУСЬН Φ НЕСЛАВКИ;

εὐδοκιμέω ‘to be of good repute, to be distinguished in’ in L40 is СЛАВКИ Φ НЕСКОУСЬН Φ ΚΙТИ ‘(to be renowned and skilful’).

The two Slavonic notions of ‘fame’ and ‘skill’ are not synonyms outside the context. These examples could also fit in the first two groups of double translations. On the one hand, their combined meanings depict the complex semantical structure of the Greek word, i.e. they are complementary to each other (group 2), and on the other, the Slavonic word СЛАВКИ is an etymological translation of the root -δοκ-, cf. δόξα ‘repute, glory’, whereas (Не)СКОУСЬН is a standard parallel to the Greek (ά)δόκιμος39 (group 1).

The classification of the double translations is not only an attempt to confine each example to a group – as it became apparent, some attributions can be disputed – but also to point out the variety in their structure and inner logic. The Old Church Slavonic translation of Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts is far from literal, sometimes it is pleonastic compared to the Greek source. Here the double translations are both a method to accurately convey the sense of the original and a stylistic device typical for the translator.

Consistency of translation and comparison with other Old Church Slavonic texts

E. Hansack considered the use of double translations a distinctive feature of the production of a single translator (John the Exarch) or a group of translators from his school. Evidence from other works reveals that this was a more broadly used,

38 See e.g. E.A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100), Leipzig 1914 (s.v. ἄλογος).
39 Cf. Řecko-staroslověnský index…, (s.v. ἀδόκιμος); Slovník jazyka staroslověnského… (s.v. НЕСКОУСЬН).
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but not ubiquitous linguistic method in all periods of Slavonic literacy⁴⁰. The presence of double translations may not be enough for identifying an anonymous translator, but it does distinguish certain (groups of) works as opposed to others. A more valid argument for identification is the consistency of translation, i.e. whether the translator uses the same combinations of doublets.

One of the best examples of multiple uses of the same double translation is the last instance cited above, where two different homilies (S22 and L40) have used three times the combination ἀσκούσιν καὶ σλαβὴν for δόκιμος and its derivatives. The same homilies have another doublet in common (not identical, but of the same root): τὰ βασίλεια ‘kingly dwelling, palace’ πολατὶ καὶ εὐαστεῖ L40, καὶ πολατὶ Καὶ εὐαστὲ S22. Some similarities can be traced also between S22, L41, and L90, e.g. the rendering of ψυχή as ὁμοῦ καὶ φυμὶ in all of them (and nowhere else) and the tendency to translate ‘silence’ using two words (σιγή and ἰσχυρία in L41, ἰσχύρια in L90, and σιγάω in S22 all have double translations, the examples are listed above). On the other hand, there are many variations, e.g. the doublets for ‘silence’ are not the same, παννυχὶς has at least three different renderings in L41 and S22 (see above), and the interesting Greek verb ἔξιστημι ‘drive s.o. out of his senses; intr. be out of o.’s wits’ is translated in L90 as ἕξιστημι καὶ ἤπαθη ὁμοῦ (ἐκστήσειν ἃν τῶν κατὰ φύσιν φρενῶν), and in S22 as ὁμοῦ ποταμίων καὶ ἡπάθες ὁμοῦ (οἱ ἔξιστηκότες). Variation does not necessarily mean independence of translations – sometimes there are as many as three different double translations of a Greek word in a single homily, cf. S22 σκανδαλίζειν ‘cause to stumble, lead into sin’, rendered as σκανδαλίζειν καὶ σκανδαλίζειν ὁμοῦ (οἱ σκανδαλιζόμενοι).

The conformity between the double translations in S22, L40, L41, and L90 is by no means a matter of coincidence. It supports the assumption that these homilies were translated by a single Bulgarian translator who tended to explain and expand on the Greek original. This conclusion results in another important issue. Homily S22 is not present in the longer Zlatostruy (L), and L90 is from the second part of L (L46–L137), which was added to the first 45 homilies at a later stage. If they were produced by the same translator as the homilies from the first part of L (L40 and L41 and possibly some others), it is beyond doubt that all of them were part of the original Old Bulgarian collection Zlatostruy from the early 10th century. This is a solid argument in favour of the unity between the first part of L, its second part, and the shorter Zlatostruy (S).

The comparison with the translations of John the Exarch also yealds some noteworthy results. E. Hansack gives more than 200 examples of doublets from

⁴⁰ See the literature in notes 16 and 17 above.
Exarch’s translations of *Hexaemeron* (Š.), *De fide orthodoxa* (Ekth.), and *Vita Chrysostomi* (V.Ch.)\(^41\). Some of them are close to the examples from Zlatostruy:

\[ \text{ὑμνεῖν} – Š. χαλάνθη καὶ κλαδίνθη\(^{42}\), L41 μολάνθη καὶ χαλάνθη; } \\
\[ \text{λόγος} – Š. σκληρύνεται καὶ λόγος\(^{43}\), L12 οφθαλμὸ καὶ λόγος; } \\
\[ *άδυναμία – Ekth. ομοσπονδία καὶ λίγησι καὶ λίγησι\(^{44}\), ραθύμια – L102 λίγησι καὶ λαθοῦσα; } \\
\[ *δεικνύναι – Š. κακοποιεῖται καὶ ξαφνηταί \ \ (ΣΧ. οφθαλμὸ καὶ κακοποιεῖται\(^{45}\), ἐντύθημι – L12 ξαφνηταί καὶ κακοποιεῖται; } \\
\[ \text{ἐπιθυμεῖν} – V.Ch. χαλάτθη καὶ χοτάτη, χαδάτη καὶ χοτάτη \ (ἐπιθυμία – χαλάνθης καὶ χαλάνθης; } \\
\[ \text{πρόνοια} – V.Ch. προμὺνεται καὶ στρον, L40 προμὺνεται καὶ στρον, L41 πεὺάλη καὶ τροφῆ, } \]
\[ \text{cf. προνοεῖν – V.Ch. πημὶ σα καὶ στροντηνί.} \]

The similarities, although too general, do not exclude a possible connection or mutual influence between the two groups of texts, which originate from the same area, time-period, and literary circles. However, the few concurring instances are not sufficient for positive identification of the anonymous translator of the homilies in Zlatostruy.

J. Reinhart gives another perspective to the topic\(^49\). In his research on hendiadys as a stylistic device he finds ca. 30 parallels between the double renderings in the 10\(^{th}\)–11\(^{th}\)-century Slavonic translation from Latin of the homilies of Pope Gregory the Great (Bes.), and the Scripture (especially *Psalms* and *Proverbs*). He argues that some of the examples are direct stylistic and lexical borrowings, due to the exceptional influence of the Bible on medieval literature, although the phenomenon should not be overestimated\(^50\). Few of them comply with the examples from the Zlatostruy collection, e.g.:

Bes. ad delectationem προς ἀγαλλίασεσαι καὶ προς ἄγαλλίασεσαι, cf. Ps 34, 9 exsultare et delectari, Ps. Sin. κ’ χαλάδοκατι καὶ, καλάδινθη κα (LXX ἀγαλλίασεσαι, τερψθῆσαι), and Ps 67, 4 epulari et exsultare et delectari, Ps. Sin. κ’ χαλάδοκατι κα, κ’ χαλάδοκατι

---

\(^{41}\) E. Hansack, *Zum Übersetzungsstil...*, p. 138–171. E. Hansack claims that the overall number of the verified instances is five-time more, but he includes also pronouns, conjunctions, and particles, as well as many examples from parts of the text without Greek Vorlage.

\(^{42}\) Ibidem, p. 139.

\(^{43}\) Ibidem, p. 145.

\(^{44}\) Ibidem, p. 153. The example is without Greek, E. Hansack reconstructs *άδυναμία.*

\(^{45}\) Ibidem, p. 154. The example is without Greek, E. Hansack reconstructs *δεικνύναι.*

\(^{46}\) Ibidem, p. 155.

\(^{47}\) Ibidem, p. 157–158.

\(^{48}\) Ibidem, p. 158, 162. The two variants from Zlatostruy are very suitable for their respective contexts.

\(^{49}\) J. Reinhart, *Une figure stylistique...*, p. 597–606.

\(^{50}\) Ibidem, p. 602–603.
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…

Bes. praedicare καθάτι οὐγνήτι, cf. Ps 93, 12 erudire et docere, Ps. Sin. nακαζάτι, οὐγνήτι (LXX παδενύς, διδάξες) – L12 ἐντίθημι οὐγνήτι καθάτι (the same in S. and V.Ch., see above).

These examples support the idea, that double translations are of different origins, some of them are phraseological expressions which circulated between multiple texts, while others are unique and serve as distinctive stylistic features.

Chrysostom’s commentaries on Acts are not the only texts in Zlatostruy with double translations. Some of the attested examples in the other homilies are the following: L2 ἀσινής καφαννῷ και ζενῷ βρόκα, εἴδωλομανίς ξενοπήλαι, τὸν νόημαν πληροῦντες χαλκόν φλεβάμενον καὶ συκονυμαδάμενον καὶ; L3 ἀφόρητος λουτρὶ καὶ χάλακτε, βασιλεία ὡς καὶ χάρακτας, ἐπήρειον οἰκειόνην καὶ ημερότητα, παρακαλέω μοιλα καὶ συγκαθάμα, συλλογίζομαι πρεμπλάλατον, πρεμπλασμένον, φέρω πρόκεστρυφτες καὶ ποιητῆς; L4 διαβάλλω περιεπλατο (πετανημένος πρόκαμπνῃ καὶ πλάκαλ, χαλκοτύπος καφαννῷ καὶ κρύπνυ; L9 γεωργός χερελάτελῳ καὶ σπατφώ; L11 τοῦ παραδείσου ἡ τρυφή παρακλήτης, κρίνομαι ραςφῶμῃ καὶ σφονή, χαλκοτύπος καφαννῷ καὶ κρύπνυ; L37 καρηβαρία τὰς ταχὺς τούς σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσαντες καὶ σφονήσα…

Without a thorough study, it is impossible to determine the origin of each double translation and its possible implications about the identity of the translator(s).

Conclusions

The Old Church Slavonic translations of John Chrysostom’s Commentaries on Acts, which were included into the early 10th-century collection Zlatostruy, have many features in common suggesting that they were translated together, possibly by one or two translators (since some of the homilies radically deviate from the available Greek texts) in the literary circle around the Bulgarian Tsar Symeon (893–927). One of the traits they share is the frequent use of double translations. The study shows that doublets can be viewed both as a manifestation of rigorous

51 Ibidem, p. 601, no. 16; Slovník jazyka staroslověnského… (s.v. ῥάδκαννι).  
52 J. Reinhart, Une figure stylistique…, p. 601, no. 7.  
53 Cf. V.Ch. διαβάλλω πετανημένος καὶ τρυφή πετανημένος καὶ κρύπνυ, E. Hansack, Zum Übersetzungsstil…, p. 147, as well as S22 οἱ σκανδαλιζόμενοι παρασκανδάλιμον καὶ εἰλαμάλιμον καὶ.  
54 Cf. V.Ch. αἰφνίς ρίς μερίς γήγονος ἡγούμενος, E. Hansack, Zum Übersetzungsstil…, p. 141.  
55 Cf. L41 χαλκοτύπος ζαλτᾶς καὶ κρύπνυ, mentioned above.  
56 Some additional examples and commentary on the extensive and interesting vocabulary of the collection see in: A. Dimitrova, Zлатоствруят…, p. 81–444.
principles of literal translation and as a stylistic device aiming at synonymity and linguistic variety. On the one hand, they are a distinctive feature that defines the translator’s style and sets one group of texts apart from other Old Church Slavonic translations. On the other hand, the use of double translations in many different texts makes them part of a large and complex network of medieval intertextuality.

**Double translations in the Old Church Slavonic translation of Chrysostom’s homilies on Acts (List)**

- ἀγρός – ḥλѣвьць или есьло L41
- ἄδοκιμος – нечисъсънъ и невлакънъ S22
- αἰτία – кинъ налъкъ и отълъкъати S22
- ἀκίνδυνος – бѣлъ бѣлъ и бѣлъ каꙁнъ да есть сѧ не боꙗт S22
- ἀκτίνες ἡλιακαί – свѣтъсъ свѣтъци сѧ и лоѫла S22
- ἀλγείω – жалътъ и неꙁілъки S22
- ἀλογηθέω (ἀλογηθεῖς) – ѹмлъатъ и ѹсрамътъ сѧ L88
- ἄλογον – конъ или коꙁтъ нѣкъ L12
- ἀλόγω – ѹмлъатъ и ѹсрамътъ сѧ L88
- ἀναπίπτω – обꙁ мнътъ Л41
- ἀναπνέω – отъдѣхътъ ѹустѣтъ сѧ L41
- ἀνιατος – бѣда и болѣꙁь S86
- ἀνίσταμαι, ἀνακτάομαι – въстатъ, въꙁвестъ самъ L104
- ἀπαξιόω – отметатъ прѣобъдѣтъ L88
- βασιλεῖος (βασιλεία) – полатꙑ и владѣлъ L40 / въ полатꙑ къ владѣламъ S22
- δάκνω – сердца досѧщъ прѣꙁьрѣнный L102
- διαλέγομαι – ѹуѣдъ бесѣдоватъ L86
- διανίστημι – въꙁбѣсътъ и вѣстѫпътъ (ꙁима) L90 / (οἱ ἐξεστηκότες) ѹмъ погꙁбѣвꙁъ
- ἐπιθυμέω – желѣтъ и ѹѧдатъ S22
- ἐπιθυμία – желанъ и ѹѧданъ S22
- ἐπιμέλεια – потрѡжденъ и прѢлежанъ S22
- ἐπιτάττω – ѹлѣтъ строѫтъ S22
- εὐδοκιμέω – славъ и нечисъсънъ кътѣ L40

*List consents to a different form of the text and is not included in the translation.*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Slavic 1</th>
<th>Slavic 2</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἡδονή</td>
<td>сласть</td>
<td>сласть</td>
<td>L86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡθος</td>
<td>нравъ</td>
<td>обща</td>
<td>S22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡσυχία</td>
<td>како</td>
<td>како</td>
<td>L90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θρῆνος</td>
<td>сльсъль</td>
<td>плаьнь</td>
<td>L41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταπίπτω</td>
<td>устѫпатъ</td>
<td>убꙑватъ</td>
<td>L86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατηγορέω</td>
<td>на нꙑ глаголатъ</td>
<td>осѫждатъ</td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατορθόω</td>
<td>добрꙑѩ</td>
<td>прѣмꙑѩ</td>
<td>L40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κραυγή</td>
<td>клꙑь</td>
<td>мѧтежь</td>
<td>L90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρίσις</td>
<td>ꙁаꙁратъ</td>
<td>сѫдъ</td>
<td>S22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόγος</td>
<td>ѹмъ</td>
<td>мꙑсль</td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λύω</td>
<td>съкаꙁатъ</td>
<td>радѣшътъ</td>
<td>L40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μακρόθυμος</td>
<td>кротъкъ</td>
<td>трѫпѣлъ</td>
<td>L90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νόμος</td>
<td>ѹставъ</td>
<td>стро</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραινέω</td>
<td>ѹтъ</td>
<td>поѹщатъ на добро</td>
<td>L86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πενθέω</td>
<td>жалътъ</td>
<td>плакатъ</td>
<td>L86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πενία</td>
<td>ѹбожьство</td>
<td>нщета</td>
<td>L40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρόνοια</td>
<td>пеаль</td>
<td>трѹдъ</td>
<td>L41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσκυνέω</td>
<td>кланѢтъ</td>
<td>молътъ</td>
<td>L88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προστασία</td>
<td>стро̣нъ</td>
<td>побыженъ</td>
<td>S22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ῥᾳθυμία</td>
<td>лѣность</td>
<td>слабость</td>
<td>L102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σήπω</td>
<td>ѹтьль</td>
<td>гнѣлъ</td>
<td>L102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σιγάω</td>
<td>мльатъ не бесѣдоватъ</td>
<td>нщета</td>
<td>S22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σιγή</td>
<td>мльанъ</td>
<td>щѹъанъ</td>
<td>L41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκανδαλίζειν</td>
<td>прѣрѣсътворъ</td>
<td>блаꙑь</td>
<td>L86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκοπέω</td>
<td>съмотрѣтъ</td>
<td>блюстъ</td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκυθρωπός</td>
<td>дрѧхлъ</td>
<td>скръбьнъ</td>
<td>L86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπουδή</td>
<td>тъщанъ</td>
<td>врѣтѣнъ</td>
<td>S22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στενωπός</td>
<td>стьгна</td>
<td>дворъ</td>
<td>L41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναλίζομαι</td>
<td>ꙗстъ</td>
<td>пѣтъ</td>
<td>L102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφριγάω</td>
<td>юнъ</td>
<td>тѹънъ бѢтъ</td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφῦρα</td>
<td>млатъ кладъво</td>
<td>L41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφῦρα</td>
<td>млатъ кладъво</td>
<td>L41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Keywords: double translations, John Chrysostom, Old Church Slavonic translations from Greek, Zlatostruy, homilies on Acts, Preslav literary school.
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